Deliverable 3.3.6
Support and Guidance
June 9, 2004

INTRODUCTION

Deliverable 3.3.6 of the contract indicated that Intelligence Consulting (IC) will provide support and guidance to pilot districts via onsite visits (see **Appendix A** for work scope as originally proposed.) Pilot districts would indicate their interest via a statewide survey conducted by IC.

As directed by OPI staff and implemented by IC, this deliverable was modified from "support and guidance to pilot districts" to the collection of district level information. Such district level information was envisioned by OPI to be very helpful in understanding where districts were relative to education data technology. Moreover, it was hoped that the results of the survey could help OPI best determine and direct OPI's next steps in technological improvements in support of education data technology. Particular interest was given to questions querying districts about their capacity to collect and report individual student level data. Summed up in an email from OPI's project liaison, the primary outcome of the activities associated with this deliverable was the collection and analysis of data from which OPI could, "understand the types of systems school districts are using so that whatever decisions OPI makes about its software will be compatible with what Montana schools are using.[1]"

This deliverable initially had two components—first was the creation, administration, and analysis of a district survey; and second was a series of onsite visits to OPI-selected districts. A third, follow-up phone interviews, was added later. The onsite and phone interviews provided a rich qualitative source in addition to the quantitative data collected through the survey.

METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire

In November of 2003 IC staff designed the first draft of the district survey. The survey was reviewed by OPI staff and OPI working groups with several revisions provided back to IC. The final document contained three sections and 122 fields/questions. Section I primarily sought information about the respondent school/district's current data systems. Section II asked about respondent's interest in future data improvement activities and, most importantly, solicited their input regarding future data improvement strategies that OPI might consider, and gave them an opportunity to share their data challenges. The final Section asked districts about their current ability to collect individual data elements within their different data systems. (See **Appendix** B for a copy of the survey.) By providing a broad mixture of both qualitative and quantitative questions, the survey was designed to capture input across a wide variety of topics both current and projected.

The survey was completed in February, approved in March, and posted to the web for dissemination in early April 2004. Once accepted by OPI, the survey was posted online for districts to complete. To facilitate a favorable response rate, affirm to districts that this was OPI-generated work, and share with districts that OPI was most interested in their input, OPI posted the survey on their web site. OPI informed district superintendents via letter of the survey and

[1] May 6, 2004 email communiqué from Floy Scott to large district alerting them of desire to conduct telephone interview.

encouraged all districts to respond. On the due date the number of responses were assessed and it was determined that the survey would stay online for 10 more days at which time non-respondents were contacted via email to encourage them to complete the survey.

Onsite Visits and Phone Interviews

During the time the survey was being completed online IC staff conducted onsite visits to four districts and one Special Education Cooperative. These districts were selected by OPI staff for their relative characteristics and willingness to be visited. Polson, Helena, Lewistown, and Glendive each hosted IC staff for approximately 2-hour visits in addition to completing the online survey. IC designed a number of structured questions that were used to gather information from the onsite visits. (See **Appendix C**.) Onsite questions were designed to be open ended and solicit information sharing from the onsite respondent about all aspects of their current and future designs for data collection.

To increase the representation of larger districts in the survey results, IC agreed to conduct phone interviews with five large non-responding districts (Bozeman, Billings, Butte, Kalispell, and Missoula). The content of the phone interviews was the complete content of the online survey. However, IC took this opportunity to engage in extended conversations with these larger districts on topics also found in the onsite visitations. Conducting phone interviews with these larger districts ensured that the input and considerations of the largest districts in the state were incorporated.

RESULTS

A total of 54 districts provided input via the survey: 49 via the web survey and 5 via phone. This represents 12.3% of the 440 school districts. (Some of the 21 Special Education Cooperatives also completed the survey; therefore, the above rate could be calculated slightly lower at 11.7% if calculated on the total number of districts plus cooperatives.) However, the percentage of student enrollment represented by these 54 districts was much larger at 47.5%.

Readers should be cautioned that because the number of districts that completed the survey was very small, statistical conclusions about the universe of districts in Montana couldn't be adequately drawn—even with large margins of error. A general statement that can be made is that very large districts are well represented in the survey while mid and smaller sized districts are not. In fact, the smaller the district the more likely they are to vary considerably from the input provided through this survey. Still, for those few small districts that did respond, their information is indicative of exactly where they are relative to educational data. And because this survey was not so much designed to provide statistical facts, but rather "take the pulse" of where districts are relative to educational data, the input provided by respondents should prove useful to OPI as future plans are developed.

Both qualitative input and quantitative results are included herein. While the survey instrument had 122 data elements most of these are individual data elements and focused on districts' relative ability to collect them. (Topical example, "Inform us of your current ability to collect and report data on a child's: disability, address, classes, immunizations, etc.") Assuming the majority of readers are most interested in the bigger picture we've included a brief summary paragraph in the body of the report and an affiliated appendix for each at the end of this report.

Suggestions to OPI

What may prove most useful to OPI and other interested parties are the filtered recommendations (qualitative input, comments, and suggestions provided by districts), shared by respondents and directed to OPI. "Filtered" in that the recommendations were sometimes rewritten (as objectively as possible) for readability. These recommendations touched on many areas. Duplicates were removed. However, those suggestions that were received multiple times are denoted with an asterisk as seen in **Appendix D**. Lack of an asterisk should not be construed as less important, but rather reflective of a smaller response rate and districts providing other suggestions. Appendix D holds the recommendations in their entirety. In the body of the report we've taken the best recommendations, in the opinion of the contractors, and put those forth in **Tables 1 and 2** below. Table 1 puts forth those recommendations that could be adopted by OPI at little or no cost. Table 2 include recommendations that could be implemented at medium to high cost—relative to those recommendation in Table 1.

As can be seen by the actual responses (see Appendix D) that lead to the recommendations in Table 1 the suggestions indicate a strong sense from many respondents that OPI can improve their communication with districts. Some of these communication items require doing business a different way, but can usually be accomplished with a minimum of resources. Training too is an area that is already expensive in that significant staff time and travel is involved with training—not just for OPI staff, but for district staff as well. When OPI technical training occurs it should be accurately advertised so the correct people attend, it should be complete from both a technical and content perspective, and it should be delivered in such a way that it is very effective from the standpoint of the attendee. Overall, no/low cost items that we'd recommend OPI consider include:

1. Provide same time notice of data collection to district staff member in charge of collection when informing superintendent—thus alleviating the "letter sat on the desk" syndrome.
2. Set up listservs for users to quickly and cheaply share technical information/assistance about the programs they are using with each other. Establish a single listserv then, if demand dictated, additional software-specific listservs could be developed.
3. Annually post an OPI-wide list of data collections to include: requirements, timelines, how data are used, future (next round) changes, CONTENT specialist and TECHNICAL specialist for questions. (Throughout the survey districts pointed out that frequently no single OPI person serves both roles.)
4. Make sure trainings are focused and content rich. To the extent the trainers have knowledge of multiple systems that the districts use all the better. This may mean shifting work assignments so one or more staff members can learn and train. We'd also recommend that all technical/data content training be evaluated using a simple one page attendee evaluation form designed to provide OPI feedback on how trainings can be improved.

Table 1.

Implementing the above recommendations, and informing districts that these improvements are based on *their* feedback and suggestions would generate "good will" for OPI. Good will that may be helpful in the event larger technical changes in the future require more district flexibility.

One of the most salient findings of this survey is that the majority of respondent districts are more than ready to see OPI move forward on data strategy upgrades. Time and time again districts provided input that they were already collecting student level data and could provide such data to OPI in many of the areas surveyed. (Caution: The low survey response rate, especially with small districts strongly suggests this "readiness finding" be considered not necessarily representative.)

Especially the larger districts who are well represented in the survey indicate a strong willingness to see OPI move forward and initiate data improvements. In the medium/high cost recommendations shown below in **Table 2**, data applications are frequently mentioned. These applications, recommended by districts to be state generated (i.e., state funded and supported), could include many beneficial functions for both large and small districts. Overall, medium/high cost items that we'd recommend OPI consider include:

1. Online method to collect, report, and correct education data. Application must have the ability for larger districts to import their data directly and not be required for their use.
2. Develop a statewide system to assign unique student identification numbers.
3. Sponsor an application that SPED districts, including co-ops, can use to maintain and report on special education students.
4. Eliminate the need to enter (re-key) data into OPI's online forms. Provide the districts the ability to submit the individual student level directly and have OPI then extract the data as needed from the district populated database that would reside at OPI.
5. (In lieu of number 3 above:) When OPI already knows about us and our data, pre-populate any forms with already known district data.
6. Develop an online system that allows districts to see, compare, analyze, drill down and professionally "play" with their data. Few districts currently have this capacity, all seem to sense the importance. A single state system is ultimately cheaper for Montana taxpayers than multiple different district-level systems. A single state system allows for comparisons that would not otherwise be possible. And a single system gives OPI the type of data that can be used to: a) streamline and focus OPI monitoring of districts, determine district's need for technical assistance based on student performance, c) respond to the myriad of requests made to OPI staff about education from groups as diverse as the legislature to parent groups.

Table 2.

These items are not cheap. Some more expensive than others. But all are functions every district could potentially use right now—whether they are ready or not. In addition to the application itself, there are hardware, software, training, and OPI development time involved with these as well as ongoing maintenance. But the consequences of not doing any of these things is even more daunting: a hampered ability to report accurately to the US Department of Education, inaccuracies in district reporting, and a perceived limited ability of OPI to lead districts in this important area.

One very frequently heard caveat in these recommendations is that districts do not want to lose any of the functionality that they have purchased/developed. That is, whatever OPI does need to integrate or be designed with as much compatibility as possible so that districts can still rely on their existing systems for their day-to-day collections. As mentioned above, exporting student level data out of their existing systems and sending it to OPI was a frequently mentioned recommendation.

The remainder of these results are centered on groups of questions/data elements contained in the survey. The summative findings are included below with reference to the appendix that contains the numeric and/or qualitative data.

<u>District Interest</u>

A series of questions queried respondents interest in being involved with a Data Advisory Committee to OPI, mentoring of other districts, being mentored by other districts, being involved with a local co-op working on data issues, and being a pilot site. The district specific results for these questions are shown in **Appendix E**. The OPI might consider an advisory group made up of representative districts that could help OPI determine best approaches to data strategies.

District Technical Upgrades

Appendix F lists the type of technical upgrades districts plan to pursue over the next couple of years. The important finding here is simply, districts like state departments and businesses of all types are continually looking and planning for improving their technology. Hardware, software, connectivity—all types of technical upgrades are mentioned. And these are only those planned in the next 24 months.

Challenges to Co-Ops Submitting Individual Student Data

Special education co-ops were asked about what challenges they might face if required to submit individual student records. (See **Appendix G**.) In general, these comments support the recommendation of developing or supporting a state-wide system that agencies can use for maintaining and reporting on their special education data. This could be a stand alone system, or a component of a larger state system based on individual student records.

Agencies' Student ID Numbers

The question bore out the prediction that agencies were developing student ID numbers in varied and not always unique fashions. (See **Appendix H**.) As previously recommended, a key to any statewide individual record system would be the establishment of a statewide application that generated unique student numbers. (A NASDSE Quick Turn Around Project Forum paper, Unique Student Identifiers was disseminated this in May 2004 and explores the pros and cons of various unique number options.)

Challenges in Getting Data to OPI

A number of challenges are listed in **Appendix I**. Concern about re-keying into OPI online forms is a frequently mentioned challenge as is different components of the special education data. Indirect references to improved training can be found throughout the list as well. Many of the other district challenges are site specific or general in nature.

Additional Shared Thoughts about Changes to Collected Data

Appendix J is a listing of responses to this somewhat "catch-all" question. Many of the concerns expressed here could be addressed through the fulfillment of the recommendations given previously.

Of particular note regarding special education data is the extensive comment (also in **Appendix J**) regarding the Montana Special Education Online Forms Project. The respondent took the time and effort to thoroughly express the collective hope, expected outcome, and functionality of the project. Reading between the well written lines, this consortium understands the gap between where they are and where they want to be. They like many Montana districts and co-ops they know what needs to happen to get "there." Many have committed relatively significant resources to "getting there" while others are wanting, wishing, hoping that OPI can assist them to a greater or lesser extent in getting there. Based on the results of this survey, few if any of the responding districts would be surprised to hear that OPI is implementing improvements relative to the collection, processing, and reporting of student level data.

System Staffing, Capacity, and Support

A short series of questions asked the respondents about the technical staffing patterns of the district, their upgrade frequency, capacity to submit student level data to OPI, desired frequency of updating student level data, and their preferred method of entering data. **Appendix K** provides a table for each question but the summarizations are:

- About half the respondents constantly updated their systems;
- The median number of IT staff at the respondents' sites was 1.00 with half having more and half having less technical staff;
- Just under half are staffed at a capacity to manage submission of single records while just over half are understaffed or barely adequate for such a task;
- A large majority (84%) felt it would be easy to export single record files to OPI; (A quite promising figure.)
- Updating files to OPI was divided: one-third wished to do so annually, one-third twice a year, and the rest at different intervals;
- Finally, in terms of how these respondents would like to enter their data to OPI two-thirds wished to enter the data online into an OPI-sponsored application, with the remaining one-third wishing to generate and send in their own file in a pre-established file layout. (The beauty of this is that if/when OPI develops such an application it can allow for both the uploading of batch files as well as the online entry of single records—thus satisfying the continuum of districts' desires.)

Districts Report Generation Capability

Appendix L provides information on reports. Specifically out of their current systems, what reports can be generated, how important are these reports, and in what format are reports provided (paper or online)?

Element by Element Capacity of Districts to Submit Student Level Data

Districts were asked to respond to how they currently collect, and if they don't collect how difficult would it be to collect, each of 122 different elements of student data. (See **Appendix M** for the elements and the aggregate responses.) The elements were grouped by categories. All special ed data together, all migrant data together, etc. Districts indicated if it their current system collected the element now, if not if it was doable or difficult. Data were also collected on those collecting the data on paper.

Potentially at the element by element level these data may assist OPI when they consider expanding existing collections to include or exclude certain elements. At a more macro level looking at the data categorically three very general summarizations can be made.

1. First, most districts that responded to this survey have an automated method of maintaining and reporting student level basic demographic (enrollment) data on their students. This is an important finding. Most respondent districts already have some level of hardware and software on which some student level data resides. Moreover, they have some staff capacity for handling this data. Said differently, they are ***not*** starting from scratch.
2. Second, there are many districts that have some capacity in some programs, although not nearly to the extent these districts have for systems handling demographic data. These districts with some capacity are either currently collecting much of the data in a category or it would be "doable" for them to begin collecting much if not all of the

elements within these categories at the individual student level. Having districts in the state with such expertise could serve valuable to OPI if data collection requirements are expanded in any of these program areas. These are the program areas that fall into this second level and, for many districts responding to this survey, the data elements could be collected and reported: Title 1, special education, 504, preschool, career/vocational-technical, gifted and talented, limited English, migrant, suspended/expelled,

3. Third, there are some data areas that very few districts currently have ***any*** capacity. These include a) the infant/toddler programs that might exist within a district, b) adult education programs, c) Part C (special education for children birth – 2 years), and d) post school outcomes. It would be very difficult for most of the respondent districts to collect and provide any data on students in these programs. Since these four programs have little to do with the K-12 system of education this finding is not surprising.

Summary Description of the Current Data Systems

Appendix N provides a summarization of the district specific information collected regarding each respondent's current data system across topical areas (e.g., special ed, TAG). Not surprisingly larger districts tend to have more sophisticated systems for the collection, analysis, and reporting of these data—and they have more personnel to support such systems. Districts with these larger systems (e.g., PowerSchool, SchoolMaster) show more flexibility in being able to collect new elements within their systems—whether this can be attributed to the system, the available/knowledgeable personnel, or both is not clear.

In fact this system vs. personnel question maybe an important area to look at in more depth if in the future OPI decides to move forward with some of the more technical recommendations made here. Districts anticipated to struggle the most could be lacking personnel, technology, or both. Obviously, their technical assistance needs (as well as resource needs) will be quite different depending on what piece(s) they lack.

CONCLUSION

In the spring of 2004 OPI oversaw the administration of a web survey of Montana districts specific to a variety of topics surrounding data collection. Only 12.3% of districts responded t the survey, but the respondent districts account for 47.5% of the student enrollment in the state. Although the response rate was low, this survey provides OPI some deserved confidence to step forward with recommendations for improving the way they collect, process, and report student level data. Generally, respondents were very aware of the need for data improvements. Many are looking to OPI for direction and guidance. Districts provided numerous recommendations via the survey that span the spectrum from simple to complex, from low-cost to expensive, and from doable to not-yet feasible.

The pulse of the majority of these respondent districts suggests they are ready for the inevitable changes that come with additional accountability at the federal and state level. Many have an expectation that OPI must collect more data to comply with NCLB reporting requirements. Few if any districts were surprised that OPI was asking the questions.

OPI has a number of options before it, some heavily resource dependent, others less so. If OPI were to do a mix of no/low cost and med/high cost improvements it would:

1. Go far to improve the status of Montana's education data,
2. Provide leadership and direction to districts hungry for such direction, and

3. Would ultimately provide OPI the data necessary to have confidence in future decision making and improvement strategies—because those decisions would be data-driven.

Many of these solutions are neither quick nor cheap. The details associated with the decisions are not easy either. However, to choose to do nothing (or nothing major) is neither cost effective nor expedient towards improving the education of Montana's youth today or tomorrow.

Appendix A

Originally Proposed Work Scope

Intelligence Consulting will provide customized support and guidance to a pilot group of local education agencies in the development of their data systems that will guide comprehensive educational planning.

3.3.6 Support and Guidance Methodology

Intelligence Consulting will develop and administer a phone and/or mail survey to representative local education agencies to obtain information about the status of their current student management systems. This information will provide the detail for OPI to select a group of "pilot schools" to work with the Intelligence Consulting Team.

IC will conduct on-site audits with the pilot group to identify data system needs, and make recommendations to schools and the state (on what the state can do for districts) to improve data practices that are consistent with state and federal requirements, including the recommendations and specific parameters that would aid schools in shopping for SIF compliant software.

IC will provide a written report to the grant team members that includes, but is not limited to the following items:

- Recommendations for the development of technical assistance and professional development materials that incorporate strategies to address data collection and reporting that reflect the diverse needs, resources, and situations of local districts as represented by the pilot districts.

- Guidelines schools can use when procuring software that is compatible with the SIF, and compliant with state and federal special education record keeping requirements.

Appendix B

Survey
(Paper version of web-posted survey.)

Information Systems Improvement Plan
Survey of Districts

Note to Special Education Cooperatives:

Some Cooperatives provide a wide array of data services to their member schools. Please complete this survey for the universe of data services you provide to member schools. That is, if you provide different levels of data services to different member schools respond here as if all of the offered data services were provided to all member schools. One survey is sufficient for all your member schools.

Co-op Q1. If you provide no data services to your member schools, check here: ☐

(If you provide no data services to your schools, the majority of this survey may not be applicable. You may stop here and return the survey, but we encourage you to look through the remainder of the survey so you are aware of some of the issues that might affect you and your member schools in the future. Where applicable please provide input.)

Co-op Q2. In general how involved are you with the data process of your member schools?

Very Involved Somewhat Involved Minimally Involved Not Involved

Co-op Q3. Please share with us the additional challenges your special education cooperative encounters, or might encounter, when providing individual record-based data services to your member schools. (Example, would it be challenging for you to provide multiple records on the same student who moved from one school to another within the cooperative? One record being an exited record from one school and another record being an active record in another school.)

Finally, if you as a Cooperative provide additional data services to your member schools that are not addressed in this survey, please provide us that information in Q10. Thank you.

Persons Completing Survey

Name	Title	Phone	Survey Part #

Section I – Your Current Data System(s)

(If ALL of your current data system is paper—not electronic—check here and skip to Q1.) ☐

Data Type	(a) Contracted? Vendor Purchased? Developed In-house? Freeware?	(b) System/Database Name &/or Vendor ***Paper*** ESIS Access PowerSchool Excel Etc.	(c) Annual Cost (Maintenance + Subscription, exclude agency personnel)	(d) Agency FTE (Maintain, manage system)
1.1 Enrollment	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	
1.2 Attendance	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	
1.3 Title I	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	
1.4 Special Education	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	
Preschool Children 1.5a With Disabilities 1.5b Without Disabilities	(C) (VP) (IH) (F) (C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr $ /Student/Yr	
1.6 Career & Voc Tech	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	
1.7 Gifted & Talented	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	
1.8 Limited English Proficient	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	
1.9 Migrant Education	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	
1.10 Suspended/Expelled Students	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	
1.11 Adult Education	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	

1.12 Post-School Outcomes (Follow-up)	(C) (VP) (IH) (F)		$ /Student/Yr	

Data Type	(e) Select the grade levels covered in the data system. E = Elementary M = Middle S = Secondary O = Other	(g) Select the quantity of student level data collected.	(g) Select the difficulty/expense to update your system to collect student level data.	(h) Who in your agency owns or has access to this data? (Name and title)	(i) Are student identifiers assigned?
Enrollment	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No
Attendance	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No
Title I	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No
Special Education	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No
Preschool: w/ Disabilities w/out Disabilities	EI ECSE K O EI ECSE K O	None Some All None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No Yes No
Career & Voc Tech	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No
Gifted & Talented	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No
Limited English	E M S O	None Some	Impossible		Yes No

Proficient		All	Doable Hard Easy		
Migrant Education	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No
Suspended or Expelled Students	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No
Adult Education	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No
Post-School Outcomes	E M S O	None Some All	Impossible Doable Hard Easy		Yes No

Data systems can be designed to generate school and district reports with a focus on identifying areas of strength and areas to consider for improvement. Below, please provide information on the capacity of your 2003-2004 data system(s) to generate the listed reports.

Report Capability of Current System(s)

	System can generate:						
Reports	None / Almost None	Some	Most	All	Important?	Format	Problems Generating This Report(s):
State Required	1	2	3	4	Yes No	Online Paper	
District Level	1	2	3	4	Yes No	Online Paper	
School Level	1	2	3	4	Yes No	Online Paper	
School Board	1	2	3	4	Yes No	Online Paper	
Parents	1	2	3	4	Yes No	Online Paper	
Press	1	2	3	4	Yes No	Online Paper	

Q1. What Information Technology (IT) upgrades do you have planned in the next 24 months?

If none, check here and skip to Q3. ☐ _____

Q2. When do you plan to upgrade your system(s)? Select one.

Constantly Within 1 year Next 2-3 years Don't know

Q3. What is your IT staff capacity this year (in FTE) to handle your agency data? _____

Q4. What is your IT capacity to manage single record transmission? Select one.

Full Capacity Barely Adequate Understaffed (with no additional positions) Not staffed (but positions available)

Q5. How easy is it for you to export a file (delimited, fixed length) to OPI? Select one.

Impossible Hard Doable Easy

Q6. With what frequency would you desire to update files sent to OPI? (Dictates frequency of state-generated level reports available for district.)

Ongoing Monthly 2 X Year Annual

OPI will consider establishing a system that provides districts the choice to transfer their data to OPI. The choice would be to either a) export a fixed length text file (or similar format) from district's existing student information system over a secure internet site or b) use an OPI web application with multiple sub applications to enter data on a secure web site. The former provides maximum flexibility and utility for the local district but the cost and local maintenance remains at the local level. The later transfers most of the expense and support of a system to the state, but districts would have less control over system functions.

Q7. If only one system were developed, which would you prefer? Select one.

a: Prefer to generate my data out of my own system, even though it will need to be changed and updated to meet any new OPI system and/or data requirements.

b: Prefer to go online and utilize a standardized OPI sponsored statewide data system.

Q8. What problems/challenges do you currently have in providing (configuring, securing, exporting, submitting) your data to OPI? Please provide other input you have regarding your data systems, the direction OPI should consider for future data system, etc.

Section II – Your Interest in Future Involvement with Data Base Design and Development

The OPI will keep districts informed of possible changes to our data collection and reporting structure. Additionally, OPI wants input from districts about potential improvements. Currently, there is an internal OPI steering committee and an external large district feedback committee. OPI may have opportunities for representatives from other interested districts. If adequate interest exists OPI will create a pool of these districts from which representatives can be asked to join a committee. (Please note: At this time this is an interest barometer not an invitation.)

Q9. Please indicate your interest in being involved in each of the following activities.

a. Serving on an advisory committee that will attend every other month meetings to learn and provide input to OPI for the design of a new data system.

Very Interested . Somewhat Interested . Neutral . Not Interested

b. Being selected as a pilot site to work with OPI and contractors who may conduct on-

site audits of selected data systems to help determine agency data needs and make recommendations (e.g., improving data practices, technical assistance).

Very Interested . Somewhat Interested . Neutral . Not Interested

c. Mentoring other districts around data systems issues.

Very Interested . Somewhat Interested . Neutral . Not Interested

d. Being mentored by another district around data systems issues.

Very Interested . Somewhat Interested . Neutral . Not Interested

e. Be involved with a local co-op of districts working together on data systems issues.

Very Interested . Somewhat Interested . Neutral . Not Interested

Q10. What else would you like to share about possible change to the state level education data collected by OPI? Consider data needs you have, data management (process), technical assistance needs, collective work with the SEA, etc.

Section III – Current Capacity of Single Record Student Database

Below are fields that might[2] be included in a single record student database. Please check the box which best describes your current or immediate capacity to provide each data element from a database. Note that if you currently collect the element only on paper, there is a place to denote that information and you should not check the "now, doable, or difficult" categories. ***If you can <u>not</u> provide the element, or are unclear, unsure, or don't know leave the response blank.***

Base student information is proposed for every student. The categorical data (e.g., Title I, special education) are additional elements on students eligible for that program.

Table 3. Availability of Individual Student Data Elements

Do not have this element and would have difficulty getting it (Difficult) →
Could get this element with some lead time (Doable) →
Could provide this element right now (Now) →
Collected now by <u>Paper Only</u> →

		Paper Only	Now	Doable	Difficult
Base student information for all students A unique identification code (UIC) would be created from the fields that are italicized and an encrypted student personal identification number (PIN) would be used to prevent duplication. The PIN would have a new field. No personal identifiable information would remain in the proposed SRSD. The PIN would be the relational link to annual assessment data and the teacher of record field would be the relational link to the teacher certification data base.	Date of Data Submission	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	State Issued ID	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	District Legal Entity	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	School Code	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Student's First Name	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Student's Last/Surname	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Student's Middle Initial	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of birth	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Gender	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of Immunization	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	City or Place of Birth	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Street Address	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Name of City or Town	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Zip Code	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Agency-Issued Student ID # *	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of Enrollment	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Attendance	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Racial/Ethnic Code	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Course Enrollments (Grades 7 through 12)	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	District Exit Status	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date Exited	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Multiple Birth Order	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Special Program Eligibility/Participation	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Days in attendance	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Race/Ethnic status	Paper	☐	☐	☐

[2] Specific elements have ***NOT*** yet been determined. Your input will assist in the development of a data dictionary.

		Paper Only	Now	Doable	Difficult
	Grade or Setting	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	FTE in General Ed (membership)	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Exit/Completion reason	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date exited or completed	Paper	☐	☐	☐
* The student's social security number would ***not*** be used as a student ID.	Social Security Number*	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Teacher of record (name)	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Teacher of record (social security number)	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Student eligibility for Federal programs	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Breakfast eligible	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Snack eligible	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Lunch eligible	Paper	☐	☐	☐
Title I students	Type of program	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Subject area (Math, Sci, SocS, LArts)	Paper	☐	☐	☐
Special education students	Primary Disability	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Additional Disability Codes	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of Eligibility or Last Reevaluation	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Support/Related Service(s)	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Transition Services	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of IEP	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Primary educational setting	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Program Exit/Completion reason	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date exited or completed	Paper	☐	☐	☐
504 students	Date of Initial/Redetermination	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of 504 Plan	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	504 Services/Accommodations	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date exited or completed 504	Paper	☐	☐	☐
Preschool students	Primary setting	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Service(s) provided	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Service coordinator	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date enrolled	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of IEP	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Eligibility	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date exited or completed	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Exit/Completion reason	Paper	☐	☐	☐

Do not have this element and would have difficulty getting it (Difficult) Could get this element with some lead time (Doable) Could provide this element right now (Now) Collected now by Paper Only			Paper Only	Now	Doable	Difficult
Infant / Toddler Programs	Date enrolled		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date exited or completed		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Service setting		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Service(s) provided		Paper	☐	☐	☐
Career/Voc Tech students	Student Population Category		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Tech Prep Programs		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Follow-Up Program		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Program Completion Status		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date Completed		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date began		Paper	☐	☐	☐
Gifted & Talented students	Program Models		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Special Program Options		Paper	☐	☐	☐
Adult education students	FTE in Adult Ed (membership)		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Participant entry status		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Participant achievement		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Educational functional level	Performance Report	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Functional level attendance (in hours)	Performance Report	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Goal attainment level (e.g., GED)	Performance Report	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Separation reason		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of separation		Paper	☐	☐	☐
Limited English Proficient students	Language of Impact		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date Identified		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Method(s) of Identification		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	English Language Proficiency Test		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Test Score		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Program Exit Reason		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date Exited		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Immigrant/Refugee Status		Paper	☐	☐	☐
Migrant education students	Registered term		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Service location		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Services received		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Days attended		Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date began		Paper	☐	☐	☐

Do not have this element and would have difficulty getting it (Difficult) Could get this element with some lead time (Doable) Could provide this element right now (Now) Collected now by Paper Only		Paper Only	Now	Doable	Difficult
	Date finished	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of Qualifying Move	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Regular Term Instructional Services	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Regular Term Support Services	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Summer Term/Intersession Instructional Services	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Summer Term/Intersession Support Services	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Funding for Service/Program	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Homeless	Paper	☐	☐	☐
Suspended/Expelled students **Including long term suspension**	Incident Type	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date incident occurred	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date Expelled/Suspended	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Length of Expulsion/Suspension	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Location of incident	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Action Code	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Time of incident (during/after school)	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Victim(s) of incident	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Alternative educational setting	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Number of Disciplinary Removals	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Cumulative Days of Suspension/Expulsion	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Reason for Removal	Paper	☐	☐	☐
Part C (Early Intervention Students)	Enrollment	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Program Exit/Completion Reason	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Eligibility Code	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date of IFSP	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Primary Setting	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Services Provided	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Program Exit/Completion Reason	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Date Exited or Completed	Paper	☐	☐	☐
Post School Outcomes	Employment	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Post-secondary education	Paper	☐	☐	☐
	Living situation	Paper	☐	☐	☐

* If your agency issues student ID numbers what is the make up of that number? For example, SSN, sequential number, alpha/numeric code based on name and birth date.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your input.

Appendix C

Onsite Survey Questions

1. **What does the current system look like?**
2. **What problems are they having getting the necessary data?**
3. **How are they transferring data between sites, programs, OPI? What data are transferred?**
4. **What challenges are experienced in storing, retrieving, accessing data?**
5. **How are they using their data? What reports are generated?**
6. **What timing issues, if any are they experiencing?**
7. **What technical challenges are they experiencing?**
8. **What do they need that is not available?**
9. **What concerns recommendations would they share with OPI?**
10. **What reports would you like to see available?**

Appendix D

No/Low Cost and Med/High Cost Respondent-Generated Suggestions for OPI

Key to Tables 1 and 2

Com. = Improved Communication
Training = Change in Training
Time = Increased Time
Data App = OPI-supported data application
Reporting = Increase reporting capacity for districts
Misc. = Miscellaneous
* = Frequently heard suggestion

No to Low Cost Suggestions to OPI			
Topic	$$		Suggestion
Com		*	OPI should send a copy of memo's or informational requests to target key staff persons in local districts **in addition to the Superintendent**. Information about reporting requirements, technical changes, etc. is time sensitive and cannot afford to sit on the superintendent's or secretary's desk until they determine who should respond to a request.
Com			OPI should sponsor specific listservs to target key staff persons. For example, one group could focus on PowerSchool, another on School Master, another on Montana Forms. Users around the state could use as a no-cost way of communicating generally with each other, learn techniques, provide TA. OPI can use to communicate directly with the IT people. Maybe SAM (School Administrators of Montana) could support listservs of information.
Com		*	OPI needs to continually work on internal communication among themselves and across the different departments. At times incomplete communication among OPI adds to the problems we experience.
Com			We'd like more consistency when we are monitored for compliance. OPI comes to the district/consortium and collects information, then provides feedback based on our completion of forms. But the feedback is inconsistent from OPI.
Com			OPI should provide an annual list of what data (collections, reports, and elements within reports) are required, when, and how. Do not deviate from this list.
Com			OPI should provide state level direction on ethnicity. It is frustrating in that we cannot ask for ethnicity, but are asked to break data down by ethnicity.
Com		*	OPI needs to inform districts how OPI is using the data. Districts don't know if or how certain information is used (e.g., Carl Perkins) and therefore are not as invested in the provision of information.
Com			OPI should provide guidance on security levels and who should have access to data, as some districts are struggling with this. By providing a minimum standard, districts can uniformly adopt.
Com	$		OPI needs to provide an online directory of schools
Com	$		Maintain and make available (via web) up to date lists of which districts use which applications to collect different data. Districts can use this to contact one another for TA.
Com	$		In Title 2, Part D OPI has identified 4-5 goals and has an improvement/technical plan for Feds. OPI should provide a list of these initiatives, and more importantly the activities (e.g., local/regional inservices, state-wide institutes, higher ed course work) that support each of these goals so districts can determine in advance how to

			incorporate them in their improvement work.
Training			When OPI conducts video trainings show technical "how-to" components on computer screen don't just talk through the technical tasks
Training	$	*	Districts desire state level personnel to come to the local sites and provide individual technical support. OPI staff who are aware of both the technical and content of the data, have an understanding of what is doable, and work with other districts and can therefore share best practices.
Training	$		On site training by OPI staff is much more helpful than video training; especially as it involves our district data. Provide regional trainings that are technical as well as content based. Although video conferencing can be effective, compressed video is very hard to watch for extended times. We'd prefer driving longer an extra 75 miles to go to a face-to-face meeting.
Training	$		Local training is expensive—whether OPI sends staff or we send staff. OPI needs to update their training annually and make sure it is providing all that we need.
Training	$$	*	OPI trainings should be specific to the applications we have: web-based application, Power School, School Master, SASI, paper, etc. Provide us the details needed for each system.
Time			OPI should always give us a chance to view our district data **before** it is released to the public.
Time			OPI should provide more time between distribution of data collection forms and submission deadline. Districts need more time; notification from OPI when a deadline is 8 weeks away would be helpful. Short term turn around requests are unreasonable given other duties of staff. Collections that are not standardized from one collection to another need more time to complete.
Misc.			OPI should not ask for archived information. What happens when OPI asks for such data without warning: we have to go through basement archives boxes, re-create, which is a large workload issue.
Misc.			OPI should establish formal regions, thus maximizing common interests, services to students, professional opportunities, etc. Such regions should be established for all topical areas.
Misc.			OPI should examine if biennial reporting would work for some collections.
Misc.	$		OPI should expedite changes quicker throughout the entire state. Many changes take 3 years (too long) to move from West to Eastern part of Montana.

Medium to High Cost Suggestions to OPI			
Topic	$$		Suggestion
Data App	$$		OPI should provide a "state engine" that would simplify Power School users submission of accurate, timely data
Data App	$$	*	OPI should create a state application for reporting (IDEA) child count data. Provide additional reports through this system.
Data App	$$	*	OPI should develop the ability for districts to upload data files directly, if they choose, to OPI. Or do on-line entry. Districts want to be able to export out of their existing systems and import into OPI collection systems. Any new data structure that OPI requires should accommodate the ability for districts to submit data from their own systems. There is a concern/perception that OPI requires double entering of data. The online systems require that data be entered into from districts applications and reports into the OPI forms. Districts with the capacity would like to eliminate the need to enter

			data into these forms.
Data App	$$		OPI should develop a system for districts to directly report our discipline data, at the incident level. Then OPI cold extract an electronic aggregate report, that we could check.
Data App	$$	*	We have to re-key our data into the fall reports, hope that OPI could peek inside and grab what it needs instead of us re-keying.
Data App	$$		OPI should develop a statewide system of surveying students after they leave secondary education.
Data App	$$	*	We need a consortium-wide special ed data system that allows and correctly handles data on special education students that moves within the consortium to another district. The system needs to handle the duplicate records correctly when reporting to OPI. Sponsor an application that SPED co-ops can use. One system is better than 36.
Data App	$$		OPI should develop a consolidated collection at the student level. Give us the 300 or so fields for a complete collection and we can submit the data based on that file layout for all of our OPI-required data submissions.
Data App	$$		OPI should have our testing forms "pre-slugged."
Data App	$$	*	OPI should provide ***pre-populated*** (web) forms for districts to complete and submit required submissions. With online forms, (e.g., title forms for funds) have a template available to districts that contains what the district provided OPI last year. Pre-fill and allow districts to edit so they don't start with a blank form each time Build off previously submitted data. Reduce or eliminate re-entering of information that isn't likely to change from the district's perspective
Data App	$$$		OPI should provide a statewide system such as Power School, Tetra Data, and have a system specialist work with the districts and co-ops to learn the system.
Data App	$$$	*	Our district is as conservative as most, however, if logic and reason for a state-issued unique ID number are demonstrated, then with a reasonable effort we can make it happen. It would be best for students, even though it would multiply the work at the district level. Having the unique identifier that tracks to the university system would be best.
Data App	$$$		OPI should host our data instead of us. They could support the administration of the system instead of all of the districts supporting their own different systems.
Data App	$$$		OPI should develop a state system that districts can use to track high school students for Carl Perkins, those that attend two or more voc tech classes, moving toward college. Then have reports available as needed for OPI and for districts to use.
Data App	$$$		Statewide there needs to be a clearinghouse of old information that we can access. From state address books, from Governor's Office, to transportation, etc. The state can house the data and provide us access as we need.
Report-ing	$$		The OPI website allows us to go in and get report card data and is user friendly and in the right direction. We'd like to see more data like this.
Report-ing	$$	*	OPI needs to support a data application that allows districts to take their special education data, and disaggregate by any variable
Report-ing	$$	*	Local districts need to be able to manipulate their data. Have the coop host our data and support that functionality through the OPI.
Report-ing	$$$	*	OPI should develop report capability for districts to utilize data they've reported to OPI. OPI should provide us a report system that gives us control, ability to disaggregate, etc. all of our data for our improvement purposes.
Report-ing	$$$		OPI should devise a system that allows us to compare our school results to others
Report-ing	$$$		OPI should devise away to look at teacher demographic data tied to student level outcome data. This could be used for NCLB reporting.
Misc.	$$		Districts would like to get our student testing results back earlier. The numbers we received didn't agree with what we submitted. We'd also like a way to check our

			numbers against what the state is reporting.
Misc.	$$$ $		Long term dream – develop a system that would automate the generation of improvement plans. For example, the Innovative Schools Program has category and goals. The state system could have a sate suggested list of categories and goals to work from then a list of suggested objectives to choose from (e.g., known in-services, speakers, higher ed classes, national conferences). Districts can choose from the list and/or develop their own objectives. Those professional trainings that are 'approved for expenditure' can be so marked by OPI.

Appendix E

Onsite Survey Questions

Q9 Districts expressing interest in being involved with activities.

Serving on an OPI Data Advisory Committee

Very interested	*Somewhat interested*
Billings	East Helena Elem
Bozeman	Eastern Yellowstone Coop
Butte	Frenchtown K-12 Schools
Central Mt Learn Res Ctr	Great Falls Elem
Colstrip Elem	Hellgate Elem
Davey Elem	Lambert Elem
Havre Elem	Missoula
Helena Elem	Plentywood K-12 Schools
Kallispell	Whitefish Elem
Lame Deer Elem	
Lewistown Elem	
Lockwood Elem	
Polson Elem	
Roundup Elem	
St Ignatius K-12 Schools	

Mentoring Other Districts Regarding Data Issues

Very interested	*Somewhat interested*
Plentywood K-12 Schools	Havre Elem
Billings	Kallispell
Central Mt Learn Res Ctr	St Ignatius K-12 Schools
Helena Elem	
Lame Deer Elem	
Lewistown Elem	
Polson Elem	
Roundup Elem	

Being Mentored By Other Districts s on Data issues

Very interested	*Somewhat interested*
Bozeman	Glendive Elem
Kallispell	
Central Mt Learn Res Ctr	
Lewistown Elem	
Roundup Elem	

Being Involved with Local Co-Op

Very interested	*Somewhat interested*
Arlee Elem	Glendive Elem
Plentywood K-12 Schools	Lambert Elem
Helena Elem	Billings
Polson Elem	Great Falls Elem
Kallispell	Colstrip Elem
Central Mt Learn Res Ctr	Garfield County H S
Lewistown Elem	Eastern Yellowstone Coop
Roundup Elem	Missoula
Hellgate Elem	Butte
St Ignatius K-12 Schools	Huntley Project K-12 Schools
Lame Deer Elem	Hysham K-12 Schools
Frenchtown K-12 Schools	Joliet Elem
Whitefish Elem	Mont Sch for Deaf Blind
Davey Elem	Park County Coop
Judith Gap Elem	Rapelje H S
Lavina K-12 Schools	
Missoula Area Coop	
Shelby Elem	
Ulm Elementary	
Wibaux K-12 Schools	

Being a Pilot Site

Very interested	*Somewhat interested*
Helena Elem	Lambert Elem
Polson Elem	Great Falls Elem
Central Mt Learn Res Ctr	Colstrip Elem
Lewistown Elem	Eastern Yellowstone Coop
Roundup Elem	Arlee Elem
St Ignatius K-12 Schools	Hellgate Elem
Lame Deer Elem	Whitefish Elem
Missoula Area Coop	Havre Elem
Lockwood Elem	Frazer Elem
Molt Elem	Dutton K-12 Schools
	East Helena Elem
	Prickly Pear Coop

Appendix F

Q1 IT upgrades planed for next 24 months

Additional student and staff computers to be purchased in school district.
Automation of school lunch program; update data warehouse; expand teacher access in SASI for elem attendance and grading; automation of bus transportation, student scan cards
Besides updating our server, nothing.
Computer lab, classroom computers
Constantly looking at improvements
Constantly upgrading our system as new updates are released.
Continually update systems
Driven by Technology Plan on file.
DSL
Give parents online access, make K-3 standards based report card available online at school level
Going to a central student information system database: District Master
Increase wireless connectivity. More integrated use of PowerSchool for reporting assessment Data. More use of technology assisted instruction especially for tutorial and instructional support.
Infohandler has pulled out of Montana. We're looking for a new electronic data management system.
Looking into data analysis software that could compliment our student info system. Need to be able to manipulate assessment information
Map network, add switches, Firewall, 1 new 2003 NT server
Migrate from Server 2000 to Server 2003 (Upgrade to new server hardware & switches.) Workstations upgraded to WindowsXP with OfficeXP standard desktop application.
Network hardware. Database / data warehouse solution. Accounting system upgrade. Eltronic assessment system.
Parent access to student data, upgrade our Operating System for better file sharing, voice over IP, changing WAN connection
Parent online access, trend data, may use Orion and or Plato systems to assist
PowerSchool Implementation is underway; server maintenance and upgrades necessary to maintain and fully implement data needs
Professional development and technology training, upgrading of some classroom/computer lab computers.
See our technology plan at http://www.hellgate.k12.mt.us/techweb/techprog.htm
Updating Computer Equipment and Programs
Upgrade computer workstations for teachers and some labs.
Upgrade our student information system
Upgrade software and hardware, purchase DVD players, increase network functionality
Upgrade to MS Office XP as part of tour cooperative, which is part of Missoula County government and the county determines IT upgrades.
Upgrades to administrative computers as well as in district email. Money is the biggest concern for upgrades at this time.
We are changing from School Master to Power School with the change starting 2004/2005
We are going to try and install Montana Forms on a file server and provide access throughout the County via a web-based database.
Wireless network, laptop labs

Appendix G

Q3 Challenges the special education cooperative might encounter when providing individual record-based data services in member schools. (CONSORTIUMS ONLY)

Logistically it requires too much staff time to centrally track records. Instead I monitor (on-site) the records annually. Our districts cross over a six county area. Not every district has the technology to send and receive student records across the web in a secure fashion.

We handle all special education data for cooperative schools via a computer-based program called Infohandler. We struggle with having complete data, both in the schools and in the co-op offices. We report child count data to OPI, but in most cases the data is a catch-as-catch-can process.

We also facilitate the collection of exiting data for special education students. We collect paper copies of all this data and remind school districts to do the same, but no electronic database is developed.

The only data we are actually involved in with schools is the child find process which we coordinate and collect from the schools. We are not involved with any other student data services to the schools.

The Cooperative would like to provide records on a student who moves from one school to another. Would also like to generate data such as: (1) total number of students by disability; (2) number of hours of special ed. & related services; (3) IEP & CST expiration dates; (4) export related services file to Medicaid billing.

Software, no matter how well written, has problems. We have experienced loss of data (birth dates, addresses, etc.) randomly throughout the cooperative. The level of computer sophistication of teachers is so broad that many problem arise from their lack of technological aptitude. Training only works to a degree - those who are not skilled don't learn, even over time. We changed software recently, which was a huge undertaking. The lack of a state-wide system makes it necessary to change vendors periodically because they go out of business, or don't provide support, etc.

Appendix H

Creation of Student ID

Q11 What is the make up of your agency's student ID number?

Alpha/numeric code based on graduation year
District generated number based on the year the student will graduate and alphabetical order.
Generated by schoolmaster
Graduation date +3 digit random assigned when students enroll (example 041120
Graduation year and then sequential i.e., 04102
Numbers are randomly generated by Power School
Numeric based on grade and gender
Numeric code with references to enrollment a building
Random number assigned by School Master program
Random number that is never duplicated
Randomly generated by SASI
Randomly generated by School Master
Randomly generated.
Sequential 4 digit number assigned by the computer system. Student ID and Student # are currently the same, but could be assigned differently.
Sequential number
Sequential number based on enrollment year
Sequential number that stays with the student and will be reassigned if the student transfers and then re-enrolls
Sped files are numbered sequentially.

Appendix I

Q8 Challenges faced in providing data to OPI?

Because the child count is separated out by school and grade level and not by teacher, it's hard to make sure each teacher has the correct info from the previous year. Child count was previously done by school, then by teacher which made it easier to get the right data.
Child count is our only experience. The newness of the system was a problem, but I anticipate that to be less of a concern each year.
Complete requests for data not always received or understood
Current OPI Fall Report issues: network incompatible. We must open ports so that they can get past firewalls. Need to study and find another solution. It would be helpful if the OPI IT people come to our site and help us figure out what can be done technically. I don't need to know "how or what to report" but sometimes I need real technical assistance.
If OPI requests in the current year we do not have a problem. We do have a problem with past years, then we have run a hard copy of what OPI wants.
It seems much of the data we submit we have to access back from OPI to put into other OPI reports and then resubmit. It seems many times OPI has the information needed already then asks us provide the data again.
Lack of technology assistance; OPI should have adequate technicians to communicate with local district technology coordinators
Need detailed instructions, training, and time! (I'm not sure where you'll get the time for us!)
No challenges. We currently use MayFairs and like the system.
Occasionally slow servers at OPI.
OPI has the sytem to receive data, but does not provide any support in the sending system. It's a lot like asking for something and then handicapping those whom have been asked to do the task.
OPI requires use of Internet Exploerer which is limiting
OPI requires transference of data into their forms, we have to do double entry
OPI sytem is slow!
Our person/s responsible for submitting data on limited basis is clerk/co.supt. capability is very limited. Training required to configure, secure, export data to OPI via various methods. Errors occur frequently and not detected for several years which may cause adverse situations for every one.
Power school still has not developed the requested state forms. However the online access to student data is invaluable to parents. A state sponsored system should still allow that.
PowerSdchool is very easy to configure and export data. Tetradata has a program called Data on demand that allwos PowerSchool data to be updated daily into the Data warehouse.
Problems with platform compatibility must be solved. OPI should keep in mind that many districts are managing SIS effectively—next step is incorporating achievement data and the ability to analyze, disaggregate, and make reports. We

need easy access to quality comprehensive data.
Right now so much data is only available in paper form.
Some of our schools have poor internet access. The Board Clerk and the County superintendent of Schools have reasonable access.
The standard challenges of any online system whose access is subject to change by other state or private agencies.
There needs to be a consistent in-put or dialog box (like this) as not all information fits in a select the appropriate circle.
Things are not available to us. We can go to site but not able to get into report.
Too many vaying platforms, limited text boxes, limited ways of giving anecdotal information. Just like this form, I will have to enter the same data two times as I cannot list it for LE 0474 and LE 0475. Both reports will look the same.
Until the recent Title I form change, the typing of reports became impossible to fill out because we no longer own typewriters.
Very few problems/challenges that we haven't been able to overcome.
Sometimes theer are firewall issues, for example OPI needed a portal open but there was no information from OPI to me to assist. I learn from my users instead of OPI. I'd like the information from OPI to come directly to me.
Want to submit elecronically to OPI (instead of manually retyping updates)
We currently have to reconfigure our data to fill out most OPI reports. It would be much better to have one state-wide system that could be used for state and local reports.
We want to continue to use our own system but have OPI develop a system that will accept our data electronically

Appendix J

Q10 What else would you like to share about possible changes to the state level education data collected by OPI?

Important to get information on available software to the schools to accomplish the reporting as needed at the state level.
The current and emerging data challenges from federal and other programs require a new paradygm for districts and district data generators. Production of quality meaningful data has never been more challenging.
Would be nice to have a state-wide data system in place, with state-wide student identifiers.
Problems exist with every data base sytem but it would still be benefical to have all districts and the OPI on one uniform system. We often find reports from other districts confusing and not user friendly when students transfer into our district.
The submission of text files to OPI would be nice.
As a co-op we attempt to coordinate data collection across 30+ school districts. We are required to purchase and support the systems to organize the data sent to OPI. Data we send is child count, fiscal data, and students exiting special education data.
It would be an improvement to have various OPI-required data collected for all programs at one time instead of various times of the year. OPI should provide sufficient instructions on required data collections so individuals can figure out how it is done.
Would like to be able to give OPI infomation once and have OPI access and organize the information to the numerous places it is required.
Want the ability to gather more than just the standardized test scores. Want to incorporate local assessment. Also, concerned whether any state system will interface with our local SIS.
Paper reports and data bases work well for very small schools like ours. As a very small k-8 school we have less reports than bigger schools.
We need one state wide and state-supported student information system (e.g., PowerSchool) and one Data warehouse Tetradata. They are web based work well together importing, exporting, up dates. Tetradata has excellent ability to generate reports Dissaggregate data and create Benchmark test allinged to Montana state standards. PowerSchool can also be standards based. We have set both up in our district. Security settings can be made for PowerSchool & Tetradata for personnel or groups of users allowing view only or the ability to modify or to not allow access to certain data i.e., Free/Reduced lunch or SPED.
Don't spring things on us too quickly--we need a minimum of 1 year advance notice of change.
OPI sometimes seem flightly, changing what they want and how they get it.
OPI requires that we hand enter data into their SERCI system, which is labor intensive.
We support the thought of OPI making a student level database. Lack of such a system is why we have had to go to another system. Would like better assessment reports from OPI: specifically expand to ITBS test and Math tests (state and national tests)
We really want MT testing data to come back to us so we can feed it back into our data systems
Don't do any changes unless you have a permanent and adequate funding source!
Important to insure data collected is correct and agrees with all other data used by OPI to compute GTB ANB and any other situations that determine financial and/or other types of

assistance based on data submitted.

Local data collection should be seamless with OPI's needs. Parents should be able to access data on their students. We have the technical expertise. We need OPI to point all of us in the same direction.

Provide a more standardized format for submission of electronic files. Consder the format to cross all applications (not just Power School, School Master). We've made heavy investments in our systems and need compatibility with OPI's system.

Montana Special Education Online Forms Project

We are talking about the construction of a database that will store the information and print the forms that are required for of special education teachers and directors in the State of Montana. The production of a software program to facilitate the paper work associated with special education will be a significant undertaking for the vendor that is chosen to do the programming. The technical experts from the surrounding school districts have met and discussed the technical items that they believe should be required in the project.

The scope of any data project needs to discussed and documented. This documentation should then be submitted to vendors with a Request for Proposals (RFP) from them. The group then should choose one vendor to do the work. The special education people need to have a list of reports, forms, and other items they will need to satisfy the state and federal requirements and incorporate them into the RFP.

Our final code or program will be owned by the consortium of school districts that paid for the development and not the vendor who performs the work. That way if the vendor is not performing up to expectations, either during or after the initial development, we can take the product and go to another vendor for completion. The vendor doing the work should be required to give weekly or monthly updates of their progress and provide a copy of the code written during that period.

The ISP will provide a hosting service for each school for a monthly fee. Schools could choose to host their own information on their local site but we do not recommend this approach. One of the main concepts of the project is to be able to share information as needed between districts as students transfer. It will be important that all districts are using the same version of the program for this to work. However if the ISP fails to provide the needed level of support or service and the group decides break up and to allow individual schools to host their own data that should be an option.

The data storage structure has to be built around a common platform. We are recommending that that platform be SQL server from Microsoft Corporation. The final product will have to run on a shared server hosted by an Internet Service Provider or by a local school district. SQL is a very robust platform that accommodates both of these environments and has good support in the area. (NOTE: Filemaker Pro is NOT a viable option)

<u>Database design</u>
a. The design of the database has to be such that changes, additions to the database are possible. The state and federal governments continually change the requirements and the database has to be able to adapt to those changes.
b. Expandability of the number and depth of the database fields in a requirement.

c. Built in help files for end users will be required.
d. An export function for transferring information about students from one school to another shall be built in to the system.

The application should have a web based front end for user access to the data, forms, reports, etc. Reports need to be designed in such a manner as they will be Printer friendly.

The user interface program will be platform independent. It will work with Windows 98 or newer, or Macintosh systems. It will be compatible with Microsoft Internet Explorer version 6.0 or higher and Netscape Version 4.0 or later.

Security

Security is a large issue with this type of data. This is especially true since we are talking about sharing it over the Internet. The following security issues need to be addressed:

a. Login names and password required for all users
b. Access will be limited based on the level of rights granted to that person or group.
   i. Teacher
   ii. Special Education Coordinator
   iii. District Technology Person
   iv. Database administrator
c. The data will come from a secure site using 128 bit encryption. This will protect confidential data from being read as it travels over the Internet.
d. The database itself needs to be secure from hackers using industry standard security measures at the ISP site.
e. The ISP employees who have access to the data need to be limited and possibly bonded.
f. The ISP will be responsible for, and will be required to, provide evidence of the backup procedures that will be in place for the data being stored on their site.
g. The centralized location of the data is only as good if the ISP sites is up and running. They should be required to provide a guarantee of their 'Up Time' to the consortium

Technical support

a. Individual schools should have access to add, delete, and change account information for users within their district. The local technology coordinators or special education coordinators should be assigned this task.
b. Since the database itself will be hosted by the ISP questions about missing or corrupted data, program errors, and the like will need to be directed to them. The ISP will have to provide a level of technical support directly to the special education users.
c. Training for special education personnel, school Technology Coordinators will initially have to be provided either through the ISP. Follow up training could be provided through the special education consortium.

Maintenance Fees for the ISP/Programmer

a. In a project of this type programming errors are inevitable. All errors shall be corrected by the vendor at no additional charge.
b. Fees or hourly charges for requested changes in the program shall be negotiated yearly.

Appendix K

Section II Q2 – Q7 System Support, Staffing, Capacity Description

Q2_A when do you plan to upgrade?

	Frequency	Valid Percent
2-3 years	3	8.8
constantly	16	47.1
don't know	6	17.6
within one year	9	26.5
Total	34	100.0
(NA)	20	
Total	54	

Q3_A IT staff capacity (FTE)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
.00	3	8.1
.10	1	2.7
.20	2	5.4
.25	2	5.4
.30	1	2.7
.33	1	2.7
.50	3	8.1
.80	1	2.7
1.00	8	21.6
1.50	1	2.7
2.00	3	8.1
2.20	1	2.7
2.50	2	5.4
3.00	2	5.4
4.00	4	10.8
4.50	1	2.7
8.00	1	2.7
Total	37	100.0
(NA)	17	
Total	54	

Q4 IT capacity to manage single record

	Frequency	Valid Percent
barely adequate	9	22.5
full capacity	18	45.0
understaffed	13	32.5
Total	40	100.0
(NA)	14	
Total	54	

Q5 How easy to export file to OPI?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
	doable	17	38.6
	easy	20	45.5
	hard	3	6.8
	impossible	4	9.1
	Total	44	100.0
	(NA)	10	
Total		54	

Q6 How often want to update files sent to OPI?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
	2 x years	14	33.3
	4 x years	1	2.4
	annual	14	33.3
	monthly	5	11.9
	ongoing	8	19.0
	Total	42	100.0
	(NA)	12	
Total		54	

Q7 Preferred method to enter data

		Frequency	Valid Percent
	generate own	14	32.6
	enter online	29	67.4
	Total	43	100.0
	(NA)	11	
Total		54	

Appendix L

Section II Report Capability of Current System(s)

Reports Current Systems Can Generate:

	All		Most		Some		None / Almost None		Other response		TOTAL
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%			Count
State Rpt	7	21%	8	24%	9	27%	9	27%			33
Dist Rpt	8	25%	16	50%	6	19%	0	0%	2	6%	32
School Rpt	8	25%	15	47%	8	25%	1	3%			32
School Board Rpt	0	0%	3	10%	1	3%	26	87%			30
Parents Rpt	5	16%	12	39%	10	32%	4	13%			31
Press Rpt	3	10%	1	3%	8	28%	17	58%			29

Important?

	No		Yes		TOTAL
	Count	%	Count	%	Count
State Rpt Important	0	0%	30	100%	30
Dist Rpt Important	0	0%	30	100%	30
School Rpt Important	0	0%	30	100%	30
School Board Important	4	15%	23	85%	27
Parents Important	1	3%	28	97%	29
Press Important	14	52%	13	48%	27

Format?

	Online		Paper		TOTAL
	Count	%	Count	%	Count
State Rpt Format	19	61%	12	39%	31
Dist Rpt Format	17	57%	13	43%	30
School Rpt Format	17	59%	12	41%	29
School Board Format	6	29%	15	71%	21
Parents Format	9	39%	14	61%	23
Press Format	2	11%	17	89%	19

Appendix M

Section III Current capacity of single record student database

Q #	Green indicates a "better"(technically more advanced) result than red / Data Collection Area	grn < 20%	red > 30%	no red criteria set		grn > 50%	red < 30%	grn < 20%	red > 30%	TOTAL
		< ------ difficult ----- >		< --- doable ----- >		< ------ now ------- >		< ------ paper ------ >		
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
	BASE STUDENT INFO									
1	date of data submission	1	2%	11	26%	21	50%	9	21%	42
2	state issued ID	3	8%	12	33%	13	36%	8	22%	36
3	district legal entity	0	0%	6	14%	28	67%	8	19%	42
4	school code	0	0%	7	17%	27	64%	8	19%	42
5	student's first name	0	0%	5	11%	31	70%	8	18%	44
6	last surname	0	0%	5	11%	31	70%	8	18%	44
7	middle initial	0	0%	5	11%	31	70%	8	18%	44
8	date of birth	0	0%	5	11%	31	70%	8	18%	44
9	gender	0	0%	5	11%	31	70%	8	18%	44
10	date of immunization	2	5%	6	14%	21	49%	14	33%	43
11	city or place of birth	2	5%	7	16%	22	51%	12	28%	43
12	street address	0	0%	5	12%	30	70%	8	19%	43
13	name of city or town	0	0%	4	9%	31	72%	8	19%	43
14	zip	0	0%	4	9%	31	72%	8	19%	43
15	agency issued id#	1	3%	6	15%	27	68%	6	15%	40
16	date of enrollment	1	2%	7	17%	27	64%	7	17%	42
17	attendance	1	2%	6	14%	28	67%	7	17%	42
18	racial ethnic code	1	2%	7	16%	27	63%	8	19%	43
19	course enrollments	2	5%	6	14%	26	62%	8	19%	42
20	district exit status	2	5%	7	17%	25	60%	8	19%	42
21	date exited	2	5%	6	14%	27	64%	7	17%	42
22	multiple birth order	14	39%	8	22%	7	19%	7	19%	36
23	sp prog elig or participation	1	2%	7	17%	22	54%	11	27%	41
24	days in attendance	2	5%	5	12%	29	71%	5	12%	41
25	race ethic status	0	0%	4	10%	31	78%	5	13%	40
26	grade or setting	0	0%	5	12%	31	74%	6	14%	42
27	FTE in general ed	3	8%	6	15%	20	51%	10	26%	39
28	exit -completion reason	2	5%	8	20%	21	51%	10	24%	41
29	date exited or complete	1	2%	10	24%	23	55%	8	19%	42
30	ssn	6	15%	14	35%	15	38%	5	13%	40
31	teacher of record	2	5%	6	14%	27	64%	7	17%	42
32	teacher of record ssn	8	21%	8	21%	13	33%	10	26%	39
33	student elig for fed prog	2	5%	9	21%	19	45%	12	29%	42
34	breakfast elig	1	3%	9	23%	21	54%	8	21%	39
35	snack elig	3	8%	9	24%	17	46%	8	22%	37
36	lunch elig	1	3%	7	18%	23	59%	8	21%	39
	TITLE I STUDENTS									
37	title 1 type of prog	2	5%	8	21%	14	36%	15	38%	39
38	title 1 subject area	2	5%	8	21%	14	36%	15	38%	39
	SPECIAL ED STUDENTS									
39	primary disability	1	2%	8	18%	19	43%	16	36%	44
40	additional disability codes	1	2%	9	21%	18	42%	15	35%	43
41	date of sp ed elig	1	2%	9	20%	17	39%	17	39%	44
42	support-related serv	3	7%	7	16%	18	41%	16	36%	44
43	transition serv	3	7%	7	16%	16	37%	17	40%	43
44	date of IEP	1	2%	8	19%	16	38%	17	40%	42
45	primary ed setting	2	5%	8	19%	16	37%	17	40%	43
46	prog exit-completion reason	1	2%	10	23%	14	32%	19	43%	44
47	date exit or complete	1	2%	10	23%	16	36%	17	39%	44

Appendix M (continued)

	Green indicates a "better"(technically more advanced) result than red	grn < 20%	red > 30%	no red criteria set		grn > 50%	red < 30%	grn < 20%	red > 30%	
		< ------ difficult ----- >		< ----- doable ----- >		< ------ now ------- >		< ------ paper ------ >		TOTAL
Q#	Data Collection Area	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
	504 STUDENTS									
48	504 date of determination	4	10%	9	23%	8	20%	19	48%	40
49	date of 504 plan	4	11%	10	29%	2	6%	19	54%	35
50	504 serv accommodations	6	15%	7	18%	7	18%	19	49%	39
51	date exit-complete 504	5	13%	9	23%	7	18%	19	48%	40
	PRESCHOOL STUDENTS									
52	pre sch primary setting	5	14%	6	16%	13	35%	13	35%	37
53	presch services provided	7	19%	5	14%	12	32%	13	35%	37
54	presch serv coordinator	7	19%	5	14%	12	32%	13	35%	37
55	presch date enrolled	6	17%	6	17%	12	33%	12	33%	36
56	presch date of IEP	6	17%	5	14%	11	31%	14	39%	36
57	presch eligibility	6	17%	5	14%	12	33%	13	36%	36
58	presch date exited or compl	6	17%	6	17%	12	33%	12	33%	36
59	presch exit-compl reason	6	18%	6	18%	11	33%	10	30%	33
	INFANT/TODDLER PRG									
60	inf-tod date enrolled	12	43%	5	18%	3	11%	8	29%	28
61	inf-tod date exited	12	43%	5	18%	3	11%	8	29%	28
62	inf-tod service setting	12	43%	5	18%	1	4%	10	36%	28
63	inf-tod services provided	12	43%	5	18%	1	4%	10	36%	28
	CAREER/VOC TECH									
64	voc student population	5	17%	7	23%	7	23%	11	37%	30
65	tech prep prog	6	19%	7	23%	8	26%	10	32%	31
66	follow-up prog	5	16%	8	26%	6	19%	12	39%	31
67	tech prog compl status	5	16%	8	26%	7	23%	11	35%	31
68	tech date completed	5	16%	8	26%	7	23%	11	35%	31
69	tech date begun	5	16%	8	26%	7	23%	11	35%	31
	GIFTED & TALENTED									
70	TAG prog models	3	9%	11	33%	5	15%	14	42%	33
71	TAG spec prog options	3	9%	11	33%	5	15%	14	42%	33
	ADULT ED STUDENTS									
72	FTE in ad ed	7	32%	4	18%	2	9%	9	41%	22
73	ad partic entry status	8	36%	4	18%	2	9%	8	36%	22
74	ad partic achievement	9	41%	4	18%	2	9%	7	32%	22
75	ad ed functional level	9	41%	4	18%	1	5%	8	36%	22
76	ad ed funct level attnd	9	41%	4	18%	1	5%	8	36%	22
77	goal attain level	9	41%	4	18%	1	5%	8	36%	22
78	separation reason	9	41%	4	18%	1	5%	8	36%	22
79	date of separation	8	36%	5	23%	1	5%	8	36%	22
	LIMITED ENGLISH STUDENTS									
80	LEP language of impact	2	7%	10	33%	9	30%	9	30%	30
81	LEP date identified	2	6%	12	39%	4	13%	13	42%	31
82	LEP method of identification	2	7%	11	38%	3	10%	13	45%	29
83	Eng language profic test	3	10%	10	34%	3	10%	13	45%	29
84	test score	2	7%	12	40%	3	10%	13	43%	30
85	program exit reason	3	10%	12	40%	2	7%	13	43%	30
86	date exit LEP	2	7%	12	40%	3	10%	13	43%	30
87	immig-refugee status	3	10%	11	37%	3	10%	13	43%	30

Appendix M (continued)

	Green indicates a "better"(technically more advanced) result than red	grn < 20%	red > 30%	no red criteria set		grn > 50%	red < 30%	grn < 20%	red > 30%	
		< ------ difficult ----- >		<----- doable ----- >		< ------ now ------- >		< ------ paper ------ >		TOTAL
Q#	Data Collection Area	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
	MIGRANT ED STUDENTS									
88	mig registered term	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	7
89	mig service location	2	10%	7	35%	3	15%	8	40%	20
90	mig services received	2	10%	7	35%	3	15%	8	40%	20
91	mig days attended	2	9%	7	32%	5	23%	8	36%	22
92	mig date begun	2	9%	7	32%	5	23%	8	36%	22
93	mig date finished	2	9%	7	32%	5	23%	8	36%	22
94	mig date of qualif move	2	10%	7	35%	3	15%	8	40%	20
95	mig reg term instr services	2	10%	7	35%	3	15%	8	40%	20
96	mig reg term supp services	2	10%	7	35%	3	15%	8	40%	20
97	mig summer term services	2	10%	7	35%	3	15%	8	40%	20
98	mig funding for serv-prog	2	10%	7	35%	3	15%	8	40%	20
99	homeless	2	9%	7	32%	4	18%	9	41%	22
	SUSPENDED/EXPELLED									
100	disc incident type	1	3%	6	15%	22	55%	11	28%	40
101	date incident occurred	1	3%	6	15%	22	55%	11	28%	40
102	date expelled-susp	1	3%	6	15%	21	53%	12	30%	40
103	length of expulsion-susp	1	3%	6	15%	21	53%	12	30%	40
104	location of incident	1	3%	6	15%	21	53%	12	30%	40
105	action code	1	3%	7	18%	19	49%	12	31%	39
106	time of incident	2	5%	6	15%	21	53%	11	28%	40
107	victim of incident	4	10%	5	13%	18	46%	12	31%	39
108	alternative ed setting	2	5%	7	18%	18	46%	12	31%	39
109	# disc removals	1	3%	6	15%	21	53%	12	30%	40
110	cumulative days of susp-exp	1	3%	7	18%	19	49%	12	31%	39
111	reason for removal	1	3%	5	13%	20	53%	12	32%	38
	PART C (EI STUDENTS)									
112	part C enroll	9	29%	7	23%	3	10%	12	39%	31
113	part C program exit reason	9	29%	7	23%	3	10%	12	39%	31
114	part C elig code	8	27%	8	27%	2	7%	12	40%	30
115	date of IFSP	8	28%	7	24%	2	7%	12	41%	29
116	primary setting	8	28%	7	24%	2	7%	12	41%	29
117	services provided	8	28%	7	24%	2	7%	12	41%	29
118	prog exit-compl reason	8	28%	7	24%	2	7%	12	41%	29
119	date exit or completed	8	28%	7	24%	2	7%	12	41%	29
	POST SCHOOL OUTCOME									
120	pso employment	7	27%	0	0%	1	4%	18	69%	26
121	pso education	7	19%	12	32%	0	0%	18	49%	37
122	pso living situation	8	22%	11	31%	0	0%	17	47%	36

Appendix N

Data System by Program Area

This appendix provides a summary of the district level data provided by program area. The entirety of the data table has been provided to OPI.

Programs mentioned most frequently are listed below. Note that duplicates are included in these counts. That is if a district uses PowerSchool for collecting and processing data across five areas, then those five would be counted as separate uses towards the total number for PowerSchool.

35 PowerSchool
26 Paper
25 SchoolMaster
10 Montana Forms
10 SASI
7 Excel
7 InfoHandler
7 Tetra
6 FileMaker
6 Zangle of C-Innovations
5 Headmaster
4 AS400/CIMS
4 MacSchool
2 Excent
2 SIS

Of the districts that indicated that they had a system of some sort to collect their data (including "paper") the percentage that reported that it would be relatively "easy" or "doable" to update their system to collect student level data are shown below.

	Enroll	Attend	Title	SpEd	ECSE	Pre-K	Voc	TAG	Disc
Easy + Doable	28	27	18	20	13	10	13	15	22
Impossible + Hard	1	1	4	5	6	1	4	2	3
Ratio of (Easy + Doable)/(Impossible + Hard)	97%	96%	82%	80%	68%	91%	76%	88%	88%